



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,246	04/02/2004	Kok Wai Chan	MS#307521.01 (5107)	3039
38779 7590 02/06/2008 SENNIGER POWERS LLP (MSFT) ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR ST. LOUIS, MO 63102			EXAMINER KANE, CORDELIA P	
			ART UNIT 2132	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/817,246	Applicant(s) CHAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Cordelia Kane	Art Unit 2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/14/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 – 16 and 18 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amended claims recite that the client is authenticated when the certificate matches the revoked certificate data (claims 1, 9, 11, 18 and 22). The part of the specification ([0040] and [0050-0051]) that the applicant cites that teaches this limitation specifically teaches that if the certificate is on the revoked certificate list that the user is denied access and therefor not authenticated. Therefor the new limitations to the claims are new matter and lack enablement.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Xu.

Referring to claim 17, Xu teaches:

- a. A fetching server for identifying a list of addresses corresponding to a plurality of certificate issuers, said fetching server retrieving revoked certificate status data (page 4, paragraph 53).
- b. A central database responsive to the retrieved revoked certificate status data for storing a list of revoked certificates (page 1, paragraph 12).
- c. The fetching server identifying an address from a user certificate data included in a client request, wherein it is determined that there is no match between the user certificate data and retrieved certificate status said address identifying the location of the revoked certificate data for a plurality of revoked certificates being maintained by at least one of the plurality of certificate issuers (page 5, paragraph 73) and storing the address in the central database for subsequent retrieval (page 4, paragraph 53, Figure 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1 – 16 and 18 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu above, and further in view of Adusumilli US Publication

2003/0097592 A1. Referring to claims 1 and 18, Xu teaches:

- d. Receiving a request from a user for access to the web including a user certificate, and comparing the user certificate data to the revoked certificate data stored in the central location (page 6, paragraph 96).
- e. Retrieving revoked certificate data from a plurality of certificate issuers, and storing the revoked certificate data in a central location (page 3, paragraph 45).
- f. Providing the user access to the requested web services once the user is authenticated (page 1, paragraphs 2-3).
- g. Identifying an address from the user certificate data, said address identifying the location of the revoked certificate data for a plurality of revoked

certificates being maintained by at least one of the plurality of certificate issuers (page 5, paragraph 73).

h. Storing the address in the central location for subsequent retrieval (page 4, paragraph 53, Figure 1).

9. Xu does not explicitly disclose authenticating the user if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data matches the revoked certificate data or if it does not match the revoked certificate data, and providing access to the service. However, Adusumilli discloses:

i. Allowing the user access even when the certificate matches the CRL (page 14 paragraph 192).

j. Allowing the user access if the certificate is not on the CRL (page 14, paragraph 192).

10. Xu and Adusumilli are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, certificate revocation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Xu and Adusumilli before him or her, to modify the CRL consolidation of Xu to include the authentication of Adusumilli. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to verify and authenticate a user (page 10, paragraph 137).

11. Referring to claims 2, and 19, Xu teaches wherein the user certificate data includes a unique identifier and authenticating the user includes determining whether the unique identified included with the request corresponds to the revocation list (page 4, paragraph 55).

12. Referring to claims 3 and 20, Xu teaches that the user certificate data includes an expiration date (page 1, X509 Certificate Table, Validity Period) and wherein determining whether the expiration date is prior to the current date or after the current (page 1, paragraph 5), and providing authenticated user access to the requested web service when the expiration date is determined to be after the current date (page 6, paragraph 96).

13. Referring to claims 4, and 21, Xu teaches identifying an address from the user certificate data, said address identifying the location of the revoked certificate list, and retrieving the revoked certificate data from the location (page 5, paragraph 73).

14. Referring to claim 5, Xu teaches wherein the identified address is a URL corresponding to a web service storing revoked certificate data (page 5, paragraph 73).

15. Referring to claims 6 and 16, Xu teaches comparing user certificate data to stored certificate data to identify a new list of addresses corresponding to a plurality of different revoked certificates (page 4, paragraph 62).

16. Referring to claim 7, Xu teaches identifying the address includes identifying the location of a certificate revocation list (page 5, paragraph 73).

17. Referring to claim 8, Xu teaches wherein retrieving includes retrieving revoked certificates previously stored in the central location (page 3, paragraph 41).

18. Referring to claims 9 and 22, Xu teaches:

- k. Retrieving the stores revoked certificate data from the central location, and determining an update time for each of the one or more certificate issuers, said

update time specifying a time updated revoked certificate data is published (page 4, paragraph 53).

l. Identifying an address of each of the one or more certificate issuers from the retrieved revoked certificate data (page 4, paragraph 53).

m. Identifying another address from the user certificate data, said address identifying the location of the revoked certificate data for a plurality of revoked certificates being maintained by at least one of the plurality of certificate issuers (page 5, paragraph 73).

n. Storing the address in the central location for subsequent retrieval (page 4, paragraph 53, Figure 1).

o. Organizing the retrieved revoked certificate data in a sequence according to the determined update time (page 4, paragraph 58).

p. Retrieving additional revoked certificate data from the identified addresses according to update times (page 3, paragraph 40 and 47).

19. Xu does not explicitly disclose comparing the user certificate data included in the request to the stored revoked certificate data, authenticating the user if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data matches the revoked certificate data or if it does not match the revoked certificate data, and providing access to the service. However, Adusumilli discloses:

q. Comparing the user certificate in the request to the CRL (page 14, paragraph 192).

r. Allowing the user access even when the certificate matches the CRL (page 14 paragraph 192).

s. Allowing the user access if the certificate is not on the CRL (page 14, paragraph 192).

20. Xu and Adusumilli are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, certificate revocation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Xu and Adusumilli before him or her, to modify the CRL consolidation of Xu to include the authentication of Adusumilli. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to verify and authenticate a user (page 10, paragraph 137).

21. Referring to claim 10, Xu teaches wherein determining the update times includes parsing the retrieved revoked certificate data, and the identifying address of a certificate issuer includes parsing the revoked certificate to identify a URL (page 4, paragraph 53).

22. Referring to claim 11, Xu teaches:

t. A central database (page 1, paragraph 12).

u. A fetching server to retrieve the revoked certificate data from a plurality of certificate authority servers (page 1, paragraph 12).

v. An authentication server with a certificate revocation provider loads revoked certificate data to determine if the client request is authentic (page 6, paragraph 96).

w. Identifying an address from the user certificate data, said address identifying the location of the revoked certificate data for a plurality of revoked

certificates being maintained by at least one of the plurality of certificate issuers (page 5, paragraph 73).

x. Storing the address in the central database for subsequent retrieval (page 4, paragraph 53, Figure 1).

23. Xu does not explicitly disclose authenticating the user if the comparing indicates that the user certificate data matches the revoked certificate data or if it does not match the revoked certificate data. However, Adusumilli discloses:

y. Allowing the user access even when the certificate matches the CRL (page 14 paragraph 192).

z. Allowing the user access if the certificate is not on the CRL (page 14, paragraph 192).

24. Xu and Adusumilli are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, certificate revocation. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Xu and Adusumilli before him or her, to modify the CRL consolidation of Xu to include the authentication of Adusumilli. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to verify and authenticate a user (page 10, paragraph 137).

25. Referring to claim 12, Xu teaches examines an expiration date included in the revoked certificate data to determine if the client is authorized to access the requested service (page 6, paragraph 96). The certificate is determined to be revoked according to the expiration date included in the certificate (page 1, paragraph 5 and table 2).

26. Referring to claim 13, Xu teaches further examining the next update time to determine if the loaded revoked certificate data is the latest revoked certificate data (page 4, paragraph 53).

27. Referring to claim 14, Xu teaches that the fetching server includes a default address identifying the location of a certificate authority server and the fetching server retrieves the CRL from the certificate authority having the default address (page 4, paragraph 53).

28. Referring to claim 15, Xu teaches that the fetching server has a fetching table maintaining revoked certification data for a plurality of revoked certificates, and wherein revoked certificate data maintained in the fetching table identifies an address of a certificate authority server maintaining a list of revoked certificates (page 3, Table 1 and page 4, paragraph 53).

Conclusion

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number:
10/817,246
Art Unit: 2132

Page 11

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cordelia Kane whose telephone number is 571-272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Cordelia Kane
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2132



GILBERTO BARRON JR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100